IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANTOINETTE THOMAS 129 S. 54th St. Philadelphia, PA 19139	CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff, v.	No. ______________
AMPERSAND HEALTH MANAGEMENT, LLC d/b/a CITYLIFE NEIGHBORHOOD CLINICS 1010 W. Lehigh Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19133 and CITYLIFE PA, PC. d/b/a CITYLIFE NEIGHBORHOOD CLINICS 1010 W. Lehigh Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19133	**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
Defendants.	

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action has been initiated by Antoinette Thomas (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) against Ampersand Health Management, LLC d/b/a CityLife Neighborhood Clinics and CityLife PA, PC d/b/a CityLife Neighborhood Clinics (*hereinafter* collectively referred to as "Defendants" unless indicated otherwise) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA" - 42 USC §§ 12101 *et seq.*), Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 ("Section 1981" - 42 U.S.C. § 1981), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII - 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d *et. seq.*), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act

("PHRA") [1], and Pennsylvania common law. As a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a) (4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws. There lies supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims because they arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as Plaintiff's federal claims asserted herein.

3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington,* 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district, and Defendants are deemed to reside where they are subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendants residents of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PARTIES

5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

---

[1] Plaintiff's claim under the PHRA is referenced herein for notice purposes. She is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file her lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of her federal right-to-sue letter under the Title VII and the ADA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically her federal claims under Title VII and the ADA.

6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.

7. Defendant Ampersand Health Management, LLC ("Defendant AHM") is a health management company that operates primary care clinics, including the City Life Neighborhood Clinics located in Philadelphia, PA – one of which Plaintiff was physically employed in North Philadelphia (the address in the above caption).

8. Defendant CityLife PA, PC ("Defendant CityLife") is a health management company that, along with AHM, operates primary care clinics, including the City Life Neighborhood Clinics located in Philadelphia, PA – one of which Plaintiff was physically employed in North Philadelphia (the address in the above caption).

9. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

11. Plaintiff is a black, African-American woman.

12. Plaintiff was employed with Defendants for approximately one year and one month as a Clinical Assistant.

13. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, she was a hard-working employee, who performed her job well.

14. In or about November of 2016, Plaintiff began to suffer from health conditions related to her hand, including but not limited to a contusion in her left hand, which required her

to attend physical therapy and (at times) prevented her from performing some daily life activities, including but not limited to lifting, pushing, and pulling.

15. Plaintiff reported her aforesaid hand condition to Defendants' management, including but not limited to Site Manager, Tasha Nottingham, as a work-related injury and thereafter sought worker's compensations benefits.[2]

16. Defendants' management, including but not limited to Dawn Benz (Operations Manager) and Dr. Emily Hurhwitz attempted to convince Plaintiff not to go to the doctor for her aforesaid health condition and instead insisted that she just take Motrin to relieve the pain she was experiencing.

17. Plaintiff insisted that she visit the doctor for her aforesaid health condition and was thereafter sent to employee health wherein it was suggested that Plaintiff perform light-duty work.

18. Therefore, upon her return from employee health, Plaintiff requested reasonable accommodations for her aforesaid health condition, including but not limited to light duty work.

19. After apprising Defendants' management of her medical conditions and her need for reasonable accommodations (as discussed *supra*), Plaintiff was treated with hostility and animosity by both Benz and Hurhwitz, including but not limited to (1) not adhering to her light-duty request; (2) constantly seeking to inspect Plaintiff's hand to determine if it was healed; and (3) treating her in a rude and condescending manner.

20. Therefore, in close proximity to Plaintiff's termination from Defendants (discussed further *infra*), Plaintiff complained to Nottingham that she believed she was being

---

[2] Upon information and belief, Nottingham thereafter informed Dawn Benz (Operations Manager) and Cherise (last name unknown – Human Resources) of Plaintiff's health conditions/work-related injury.

harassed and discriminated against because of her injury/health condition and that she wanted the same to cease.

21. In response to Plaintiff's aforementioned complaint of discrimination, Nottingham informed Plaintiff that she would tell Defendants' management to stop harassing her; however, upon information and belief, Nottingham failed to properly investigate or resolve Plaintiff's concerns of discrimination, and the harassment continued.

22. For example, on or about November 30, 2016, the day last day of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, she was in the elevator with Benz who asked Plaintiff if her hand was feeling any better. Plaintiff responded by telling Benz that her hand was still hurt and that she was on her way to the doctor. Benz then told Plaintiff "I hope they release you to return to full duty today and if they don't it was nice knowing you."

23. After returning to work following her doctor's appointment on or about November 30, 2016, Plaintiff was approached by Benz and asked if she had been returned to work on full duty. Plaintiff responded that she had not and showed Benz the splint that the doctor had given her for her hand condition.

24. Later in the day on or about November 30, 2016, Plaintiff was called into the office and terminated from her employment.

25. In addition to treating Plaintiff in a discriminatory and retaliatory manner because of her health conditions, need for accommodations, and/or complaints of disability discrimination, Plaintiff was also subjected to discriminatory and disparate treatment by Defendants' management because of her race.

26. For example, unlike Plaintiff's non-black co-workers, Plaintiff - as well as her fellow African-American (black) colleagues - were treated in a very disrespectful and aggressive

manner by Benz, informed that they were being paid too much by the CEO of Defendants, and had policies selectively enforced against them.

27. By way of further example, on the day that Plaintiff was terminated from her employment with Defendants, three other black employees were also terminated for no logical or legitimate reason.

28. Plaintiff was informed that the reason for her termination was because she had a negative attitude – which is completely pretextual. In fact, Plaintiff had been praised for her positive attitude in the past by Defendant's management.

29. At the time of Plaintiff's termination, she was presented with an unsolicited severance and release agreement, wherein Defendants offered to pay Plaintiff a minimal sum of money so long as she would release any and all claims that she had against Defendants, including any claims for race discrimination, disability discrimination, and/or retaliation.[3] Plaintiff did not accept Defendants' severance offer.

30. Approximately two days before Plaintiff's termination from Defendants, on or about November 30, 2016, Defendants' management announced that they hired two new Clinical Assistants, both of whom were Caucasian.

---

[3] *See e.g. Staffieri v. Northwestern Human Servs.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72115 at **14-15 (E.D. Pa. May 22, 2013)(an employer who offered severance when policies did not require upon condition of waiving FMLA claim supported finding of pretext in FMLA claim among other facts); *See also Bartlett v. NIBCO Inc.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28072 (N.D. Ind. 2011)("Severance pay packages contingent upon a release of claims which are offered *contemporaneously with the notice of termination* are *not* covered by [Rule 408]", and the motive in offering same is admissible evidence in a retaliation claim and is admissible at trial in this case); *Karl v. City of Mountlake Terrace*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59085 (W.D. Wash. 2011)(severance agreements are admissible in retaliation claims when made contemporaneous to termination, as they are not governed by FRE 408); *EEOC v. Republic Servs., Inc.*, 640 F. Supp. 2d 1267 (D. Nev. 2009)(denying summary judgment and considering as evidence in wrongful termination case that a company would offer severance when an employee is supposedly terminated in a manner that doesn't warrant severance per an explicit company policy).

31. Upon information and belief, the two Caucasian individuals that were hired prior to Plaintiff's termination started working for Defendants after Plaintiff and another black Clinical Assistant were terminated.

COUNT I
Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act "ADA"
([1] Actual/Perceived/Record of Disability Discrimination; [2] Retaliation; [3] Failure to Accommodate; [4] Hostile Work Environment)
-Against Both Defendants-

32. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

33. Plaintiff timely filed a Charge and received a notice of right-to-sue from the EEOC, thus properly exhausting her administrative remedies to proceed herein.

34. Plaintiff suffered from qualifying disabilities under the ADA, which at times, prevented her from performing some daily life activities, including but not limited to lifting, pushing, and pulling (among other daily life activities).

35. Plaintiff apprised Defendants' management of her aforesaid disabilities and requested reasonable accommodations, including but not limited to light duty work.

36. After apprising Defendants' management of her aforementioned disabilities and need for accommodations, Plaintiff was treated in a very hostile manner, including but not limited to (1) not adhering to her light-duty request; (2) constantly seeking to inspect Plaintiff's hand to determine if it was healed; and (3) treating her in a rude and condescending manner.

37. In close proximity to her termination, Plaintiff complained to Defendants' management that she was being subjected to discriminatory treatment based on her injury/health conditions; however, Defendants' management did not properly investigate or resolve her concerns of discrimination and Plaintiff continued to be subjected to a hostile work environment.

38. On or about November 30, 2016, prior to Plaintiff's doctor's appointment that day, Benz told Plaintiff "I hope they release you to return to full duty today and if they don't it was nice knowing you."

39. Upon returning from her doctor's appointment on or about November 30, 2016, Plaintiff was questioned by Benz as to whether she had been released to return to work full-duty, to which Plaintiff responded that she had not.

40. Later in the day, on or about November 30, 2016, Plaintiff was informed by Benz and Hurhwitz that she was being terminated from her employment for completely pretextual reasons.

41. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants discriminated against her by subjecting her to a hostile work environment and ultimately terminating her employment because: (1) of her known and/or perceived health problems; (2) her record of impairment; (3) her requested accommodations; and/or her complaints of disability discrimination.

42. Plaintiff also believes and therefore avers that Defendants failed to accommodate her disabilities by not adhering to her light-duty request.

43. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the ADA.

Count II
Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1981
(Race Discrimination – Wrongful Termination and Hostile Work Environment)
-Against Both Defendants-

44. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

45. Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment during her period of employment with Defendants due to her race through disparate treatment, negative comments, and demeaning and/or discriminatory treatment towards her (as discussed *supra*).

46. By way of further example, on the day that Plaintiff was terminated from her employment with Defendants, three other black employees were also terminated for no logical or legitimate reason.

47. Approximately two days before Plaintiff's termination from Defendants, on or about November 30, 2016, Defendants' management announced that they hired two new Clinical Assistants, both of whom were Caucasian.

48. Upon information and belief, the two Caucasian individuals who were hired prior to Plaintiff's termination started working for Defendants after Plaintiff and another black Clinical Assistant were terminated.

49. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that she was terminated from Defendants because of her race.

50. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination, retaliation, and a hostile work environment under the 42 U.S.C. §1981.

Count III
Violations of Title VII
(Race Discrimination – Wrongful Termination and Hostile Work Environment)
-Against Both Defendants-

51. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

52. Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment during her period of employment with Defendants due to her race through disparate treatment, negative comments, and demeaning and/or discriminatory treatment towards her (as discussed *supra*).

53. By way of further example, on the day that Plaintiff was terminated from her employment with Defendants, three other black employees were also terminated for no logical or legitimate reason.

54. Approximately two days before Plaintiff's termination from Defendants, on or about November 30, 2016, Defendants' management announced that they hired two new Clinical Assistants, both of whom were Caucasian.

55. Upon information and belief, the two Caucasian individuals who were hired prior to Plaintiff's termination started working for Defendants after Plaintiff and another black Clinical Assistant were terminated.

56. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that she was terminated from Defendants because of her race.

57. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination, retaliation, and a hostile work environment under Title VII.

Count IV
Common-Law Wrongful Discharge
(Public Policy Violation)
-Against Both Defendants-

58. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

59. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was terminated in substantial part for making a claim for worker's compensation benefits and/or seeking worker's compensation benefits and/or for her work-related injuries (as discussed *supra*).

60. It is against Pennsylvania's public policy for an employee to be terminated for making a workers' compensation claim and/or seeking worker's compensation benefits. These actions as aforesaid constitute wrongful termination in Pennsylvania. *See Shick v. Shirey*, 552 Pa. 590, 716 A.2d 1231 (1997); *Rothrock v. Rothrock Motor Sales, Inc.*, 584 Pa. 297, 883 A.2d 511, 516 (2005).

61. The temporal proximity between Plaintiff's claim for worker's compensation and her termination as well as the animosity that she was subjected to following her worker's compensation injury/claim creates an inference that her termination was in retaliation for seeking worker's compensation benefits.

62. These actions as aforesaid constitute wrongful termination in Pennsylvania.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

A. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary, pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement, and seniority.

B. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;

C. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress / pain and suffering);

D. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law; and

E. Plaintiff is to be given a jury trial as demanded in the caption of this Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By: ______________________

Ari R. Karpf, Esq.
3331 Street Road
Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128
Bensalem, PA 19020
(215) 639-0801

Dated: July 20, 2017

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

ANTOINETTE THOMAS : CIVIL ACTION

v. :

AMPERSAND HEALTH MANAGEMENT, LLC
d/b/a CITYLIFE NEIGHBORHOOD CLINICS, et al. : NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )

(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )

(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )

(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ( )

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (X)

7/20/2017	[signature]	Plaintiff
Date	**Attorney-at-law**	**Attorney for**
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com
Telephone	**FAX Number**	**E-Mail Address**

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 129 S. 54th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19139

Address of Defendant: 1010 W. Lehigh Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19133

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business

(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)

Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes☐ No☒

Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Yes☐ No☒

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:
Case Number: ______ Judge ______ Date Terminated: ______

Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:

1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes☐ No☐
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes☐ No☐
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes☐ No☐
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes☐ No☐

CIVIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)

A. *Federal Question Cases:*
1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
2. ☐ FELA
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury
4. ☐ Antitrust
5. ☐ Patent
6. ☐ Labor-Management Relations
7. ☒ Civil Rights
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases
10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases
11. ☐ All other Federal Question Cases
(Please specify) ______

B. *Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:*
1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury
3. ☐ Assault, Defamation
4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury
5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. ☐ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. ☐ Products Liability
8. ☐ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases
(Please specify) ______

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(Check Appropriate Category)

I, Ari R. Karpf, counsel of record do hereby certify:

☒ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of $150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;

☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 7/20/2017 ______ Attorney-at-Law ARK2484 Attorney I.D.# 91538

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 7/20/2017 ______ Attorney-at-Law ARK2484 Attorney I.D.# 91538

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

THOMAS, ANTOINETTE

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff: Philadelphia
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys *(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)*
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, P.C.; 3331 Street Road, Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA 19020; (215) 639-0801; akarpf@karpf-law.com

DEFENDANTS

AMPERSAND HEALTH MANAGEMENT, LLC d/b/a CITYLIFE NEIGHBORHOOD CLINICS, et al.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant: Philadelphia
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys *(If Known)*

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
X 3 Federal Question *(U.S. Government Not a Party)*
2 U.S. Government Defendant
4 Diversity *(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)*

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES *(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)* *(For Diversity Cases Only)*

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	1	1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	4	4
Citizen of Another State	2	2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	5	5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation	6	6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT
110 Insurance; 120 Marine; 130 Miller Act; 140 Negotiable Instrument; 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment; 151 Medicare Act; 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans); 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits; 160 Stockholders' Suits; 190 Other Contract; 195 Contract Product Liability; 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
210 Land Condemnation; 220 Foreclosure; 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment; 240 Torts to Land; 245 Tort Product Liability; 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS
PERSONAL INJURY: 310 Airplane; 315 Airplane Product Liability; 320 Assault, Libel & Slander; 330 Federal Employers' Liability; 340 Marine; 345 Marine Product Liability; 350 Motor Vehicle; 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability; 360 Other Personal Injury; 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice
PERSONAL INJURY: 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability; 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability; 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability
PERSONAL PROPERTY: 370 Other Fraud; 371 Truth in Lending; 380 Other Personal Property Damage; 385 Property Damage Product Liability

CIVIL RIGHTS
440 Other Civil Rights; 441 Voting; 442 Employment; 443 Housing/ Accommodations; X 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment; 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other; 448 Education

PRISONER PETITIONS
Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee; 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence; 530 General; 535 Death Penalty
Other: 540 Mandamus & Other; 550 Civil Rights; 555 Prison Condition; 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881; 690 Other

LABOR
710 Fair Labor Standards Act; 720 Labor/Management Relations; 740 Railway Labor Act; 751 Family and Medical Leave Act; 790 Other Labor Litigation; 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act

IMMIGRATION
462 Naturalization Application; 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
422 Appeal 28 USC 158; 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

PROPERTY RIGHTS
820 Copyrights; 830 Patent; 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application; 840 Trademark

SOCIAL SECURITY
861 HIA (1395ff); 862 Black Lung (923); 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)); 864 SSID Title XVI; 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant); 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
375 False Claims Act; 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)); 400 State Reapportionment; 410 Antitrust; 430 Banks and Banking; 450 Commerce; 460 Deportation; 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations; 480 Consumer Credit; 490 Cable/Sat TV; 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange; 890 Other Statutory Actions; 891 Agricultural Acts; 893 Environmental Matters; 895 Freedom of Information Act; 896 Arbitration; 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision; 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

X 1 Original Proceeding; 2 Removed from State Court; 3 Remanded from Appellate Court; 4 Reinstated or Reopened; 5 Transferred from Another District *(specify)*; 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer; 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing *(Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)*:
Americans w/Disabilities Act "ADA" 42USC12101; Section 1981 42USC1981; Title VII (42USC2000)

Brief description of cause:
Violations of the ADA, 42USC1981, Title VII and the PHRA.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.
DEMAND $
CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: X Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE ______ DOCKET NUMBER ______

DATE: 7/20/2017
SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Print Save As... Reset